

1

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

4

5 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

6

7

8

FAST FLUX TEST FACILITY DECOMMISSIONING

9

10

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

11

12

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

13

14

15

September 22, 2004

16

7:00 p.m.

17

Red Lion/Hanford House

18

802 George Washington Way

19

Richland, Washington

20

21

22

23 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES

Certified Shorthand Reporters

24

P. O. Box 5999

Kennewick, Washington 99336

25

(509) 735-2400 - (800) 358-2345

1 (September 22, 2004, 7:00 p.m.)

2 MR. PETER BENGTON: Good
3 evening, everybody. I want to welcome you to
4 the public scoping meeting for the Fast Flux
5 Test Facility.

6 We are in the scoping process. We
7 will be looking at the Decommissioning
8 Environmental Impact Statement.

9 Essentially we are looking at
10 gathering public input to find out, as the
11 Department of Energy goes about to prepare a
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, what your
13 public input would be, what should be included
14 in that draft statement that will be coming out
15 later this winter, early spring.

16 At that point, then, an additional
17 public process will be taking place.

18 I'd like to cover a couple items in
19 terms of housekeeping, if you will.

20 The restrooms are down the hall to

21 my right, heading out the lobby back this way,
22 and then take an immediate left.

23 During the course of the meeting, if
24 you have comments or questions, if you could
25 hold them during the appropriate time. During

2

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 the agenda, after I make some opening remarks
2 here, some brief remarks about the process of
3 the meeting, we will be moving to a
4 presentation by the Department of Energy.

5 At that point we will have
6 approximately 10 or 15 minutes for discussion,
7 any clarifying questions or issues that you
8 would like to ask of the Department of Energy.

9 And then at that point in time we
10 will open the meeting up for formal comment,
11 those that will be kept for the record, and
12 will be considered equally, whether you come
13 and present them orally, you have the option of
14 E-mailing your comments in, faxing them in to
15 Doug Chapin, or you also have the option of
16 writing them down and submitting them to us

17 tonight or in the near term future.

18 A Notice of Intent was issued with
19 the Federal Register on August 13th, and that
20 began a public comment period, which ends on
21 October 8th. At that point in time this
22 scoping process would end.

23 The Department of Energy will then
24 take your comments, consider them, and draft --
25 develop the draft, again like I said, that will

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 come out later this winter.

2 One thing I'd like to emphasize is
3 that the public comments that you are making,
4 whether they are written or submitted by fax,
5 et cetera, are all going to be considered
6 equally.

7 The basic ground rules, I guess, I
8 would just emphasize, if you have a question or
9 concern, that you wait for the appropriate time
10 on the agenda to raise that. If there's a time
11 constraint for you, when you need to make

12 formal public comment, if you've got a
13 babysitter or something that's going on that
14 you need to leave at a certain time, please
15 talk with me.

16 Otherwise, on the back table, that
17 table right outside the door, there is a
18 sign-up sheet for public comment tonight.
19 Please make sure and put your name on there,
20 and I will call people in the order in which
21 you signed up, unless you have talked with me
22 otherwise.

23 If we have officials here, elected
24 officials, or a representative from a
25 particular public organization, generally we

1 will provide them up to 10 minutes to make any
2 presentation or prepared remarks to be shared
3 at that time before we open it for the general
4 public, if you will.

5 Any questions or concerns with the
6 process of meeting here? Not seeing any, we
7 will begin.

8 Doug, would you come forward and

9 make your presentation.

10 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Thank you,

11 Peter.

12 As Peter indicated, the Department

13 is holding a public scoping meeting for the

14 proposed alternatives and the proposed action,

15 decommissioning of the FFTF, Fast Flux Test

16 Facility.

17 And I wanted to thank you for coming

18 night. I also wanted to add, we have a second

19 scoping meeting in Idaho Falls next Thursday,

20 September 30. Hope you will be able to attend

21 that meeting, too.

22 With that, I want to give a little

23 background on the FFTF.

24 It's a 400 megawatt liquid metal

25 sodium nonbreeder nuclear test reactor that was

1 utilized, it was built in the 1970s, operated

2 in the 1982 to 1992 time frame. It was used to

3 develop and test fuels, materials, and
4 equipment for the Liquid Metal Breeder Reactor
5 Program. It also was involved in cooperative
6 international research relative to radioisotope
7 production.

8 Currently the FFTF is shut down and
9 being deactivated. Right now the ongoing
10 deactivation activities involve draining of
11 most of the sodium coolant, fuel removal,
12 getting the fuel ready for above ground dry cap
13 storage, and taking the auxiliary plant systems
14 out of service.

15 The proposed scope for the EIS is,
16 relative to the decommissioning, the final
17 aspect of the closure of the FFTF. As I had
18 indicated earlier, the deactivation is ongoing.

19 We have previous NEPA decisions on
20 that, the 1995 Shutdown Environmental
21 Assessment. That was our NEPA evaluation for
22 that process.

23 To complete the closure project, the
24 final phase is to do the decommissioning work.

25 The scope of the EIS is to evaluate

1 what the environmental impacts of implementing
2 the preferred or proposed alternative for the
3 final decommissioning end state. We would also
4 look at the evaluation, the impact evaluation
5 of management, disposition of waste, both
6 regulated and nonregulated. The disposition,
7 management of the Hanford Site, radioactively
8 contaminated sodium. And then essentially in
9 order to reduce long-term risks, surveillance
10 and maintenance costs. And that is the scope
11 of the EIS.

12 I wanted to give an overall map view
13 of the areas on the Hanford Site that are of
14 interest to this EIS. The main area of course
15 is the Fast Flux Test Facility, 400 Area.

16 This is an overall map of the 400
17 Area. This is the main area, the property
18 protected area of the FFTF. This is the main
19 facility area for the EIS.

20 And then we have a little larger
21 scale view. This is the FFTF Reactor
22 Containment Building, and this is the main flux
23 of the alternatives that we are going to be
24 discussing tonight.

25 We are also, as I alluded to in

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 terms of the waste, we are going to evaluate
2 the possible use of the Central Waste Complex,
3 the Environmental Restoration Disposal
4 Facility, the proposed Integrated Disposal
5 Facility. We also have part of our Hanford
6 Site sodium inventory, we have Hallam reactor,
7 sodium reactor, sodium stored in the 200 Area.
8 That will be comanaged with the FFTF sodium.
9 And then also the Canister Storage Building for
10 our fuel.

11 I wanted to add that we will
12 document or discuss fuel management disposition
13 in the EIS. However, we are not going to
14 analyze new tasks, because we already have DOE
15 decisions in place that address that.

16 The proposed alternatives that the
17 Department is evaluating, considering to
18 evaluate at this time is no action, entombment,
19 removal.

20 As Peter alluded to, we will also
21 consider additional alternatives during the

22 scoping, that we get from the scoping process
23 and during the Draft EIS preparation. And I am
24 going to go into a little bit more detail.
25 No action by NEPA regulations, we

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 have to evaluate no actions. This does not
2 mean do nothing. What DOE has defined it as in
3 this context is completing the deactivation
4 work that's ongoing, which is what I alluded to
5 earlier, the fuel washing, the sodium coolant
6 removal, and the auxiliary plant systems
7 lay-up, where we would get the facility, in
8 terms of into a state of long-term surveillance
9 and maintenance for the foreseeable future.
10 This is ongoing work.
11 The first proposed decommissioning
12 alternative that we are looking at is
13 entombment, where basically we would do the
14 same work, and then we would remove the above
15 grade structures; and then the below grade
16 structures, we would fill, grout, and then we
17 would cover it with an engineered, regulatory

18 compliant barrier.

19 The third alternative we would be
20 looking at in terms of a decommissioning
21 alternative is the removal. We would again do
22 the deactivation work.

23 Essentially the difference between
24 this would be we would do the same work in
25 removing the above grade structures, we would

1 also take care of the special components, the
2 sodium filters. And then below grade
3 components and equipment and materials, we
4 would -- I'm sorry. We would also remove the
5 reactor vessel which is below grade, and any
6 radioactively contaminated materials,
7 equipment, piping, materials. And then we
8 would fill that area and then cover it,
9 although it may not be necessarily with an
10 engineered barrier, it may just be backfilling
11 and grading it.

12 And I want to remind people that the

13 no action is consistent with the 1995 Shutdown
14 Environmental Assessment. We had a finding of
15 no significant impacts that came with that
16 document.

17 This is to give a little more
18 perspective on the Reactor Containment
19 Building, which I pointed out on the other
20 bracket, is right here, is basically the ground
21 level. We have above grade, below grade. This
22 is the Reactor Containment Building. This is
23 the reactor vessel. And then we have the main
24 floor, if you had an opportunity to tour the
25 containment, this is typical of the area you

10

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 first entered when you first came in. But this
2 is more of a schematic to see the perspective
3 of that.
4 As I mentioned earlier, one of the
5 things we are going to evaluate in this EIS is
6 management disposition of waste. In
7 particular, our special components, which would
8 have a sodium filter, primary filters and two

9 vapor filters. These are basically sodium
10 filters. These are going to be managed. We
11 are going to look at them as mixed waste. But
12 we are going to look at an option. These are
13 essentially sub alternatives in the context of
14 we would do them whether we did entombment or
15 removal. So these are not decommissioning
16 alternatives. They are bounded within those
17 two alternatives.

18 We would evaluate storing and
19 treating at the Hanford Site.

20 We are also going to evaluate
21 storing on the Hanford Site, treating at the
22 Idaho National Engineering and Environmental
23 Laboratory. They are the proposed remote
24 treatment plant project. And therefore they
25 would -- we would also evaluate eventual

1 disposal at Hanford at off-site facilities.

2 We also would look at the low-level
3 radioactive and mixed waste management

4 disposition to the Hanford Site 200 Area, in
5 particular the environmental restoration
6 disposal facility and the proposed integrated
7 disposal facility as I mentioned earlier.

8 Another major feature of the EIS
9 would be evaluating the management, disposition
10 of the Hanford Site radioactively contaminated
11 sodium inventory. I mentioned we have about
12 300,000 gallons total, about 260,000 gallons
13 from FFTF, about 34,000 from the Hallam Reactor
14 stored in three tanks in a building in the 200
15 West Area, and about 7,000 gallons of sodium
16 reactor, thermal sodium. That is the total
17 inventory.

18 We would evaluate storage and
19 conversion of this inventory to sodium
20 hydroxide as product to be used by the Office
21 of River Protection.

22 Alternately we are going to look at
23 storing on the Hanford Site, then eventually
24 transporting it, converting it at INEEL, their
25 proposed -- I mean, their existing sodium

1 processing facility, where we would convert it
2 to the sodium hydroxide product, and then it
3 would be transported back to the Office of
4 River Protection for use.

5 And we have these milestones in
6 place that go into a little bit more detail on
7 this. We do have copies in the back.

8 Another area that we are going to be
9 looking at, especially when we are talking
10 about transport, management, disposition of the
11 special components, and the radioactively
12 contaminated sodium inventory, as well as the
13 sodium bonded fuel, is this is the main
14 transportation corridor that we are going to be
15 evaluating relative to packaging,
16 transportation, and accident analyses. So
17 that's going to be addressed in the EIS.

18 I want to remind people that the EIS
19 schedule that the Department is proposing at
20 this time, obviously we are in public scoping.
21 That began on August 13th, the publication of
22 the Notice of Intent. We have copies in the
23 back for attendees. That concludes October
24 8th.

25 The Draft EIS, we are planning to

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 prepare for public release in the early 2005
2 time frame. Therefore, that would lead into a
3 public comment period on the Draft EIS, would
4 be thereafter, shortly, in the spring. Produce
5 the Final EIS in the fall of 2005. Potentially
6 issue a Record of Decision in late 2005.

7 I wanted to remind people, as Peter
8 had indicated, people not only have
9 opportunities to provide comments in this form,
10 and next week's meeting, they can provide
11 comments in writing to me by sending them to me
12 here, by fax, by E-mail. Peter?

13 MR. PETER BENGTSON: Thank
14 you. At this point in time I would like to
15 offer in the process of our evening a chance to
16 ask questions from our technical folks.

17 If you have clarifying comments or
18 questions that you would like to ask, before
19 you make formal comment tonight, we would
20 appreciate that. Is there anyone who has a
21 question or would like to get clarification on
22 anything at this point?

23 If you have any questions, if you
24 would go to the mike, that would be easiest for
25 us to capture.

14

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 The people who are coming forward to
2 ask clarifying questions, we are capturing the
3 entire meeting on audio tape, as well as a
4 stenographer is capturing the comments during
5 the meeting.

6 The formal comments that will happen
7 later in the agenda will be used, again, by the
8 Department of Energy for drafting the EIS.

9 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Claude
10 Oliver, Benton County Commissioner.

11 Under the preliminary alternatives
12 identified tonight, no action, entombment and
13 removal.

14 I want to know, for example, under
15 item one, no action, what is the governing EIS
16 process that the Department would go by if that
17 is the determination of the EIS? And I will
18 also ask the question for entombment and

19 removal.

20 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Okay.

21 Deactivation, the Department has been
22 authorized to move ahead with deactivation
23 activities, based on the prior DOE NEPA
24 decisions. In particular, the 1995
25 Environmental Assessment, finding of no

15

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 significant impact, and also based on the
2 February 28 court ruling by Judge Shea. That
3 is for the deactivation.

4 For the entombment and removal, that
5 is the purpose of this scoping, the purpose of
6 this EIS, to evaluate that. That's why we are
7 doing the EIS, to determine a preferred
8 alternative for the decommissioning end state.

9 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Does the
10 Department have a work document on entombment
11 that is part of the EIS process?

12 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: What do you
13 mean by a work document?

14 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: The
15 contractor's guideline. Does the contractor,
16 does the DOE have an entombment that they have
17 opted would be the process or procedure that
18 they would go for?

19 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Al, I'm
20 going to defer this question to you.

21 MR. AL FARABEE: Repeat the
22 question, please.

23 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: If the
24 Department of Energy makes a determination that
25 the entombment is their decision, what is the

16

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 guiding document that is going to govern the
2 entombment process?

3 MR. AL FARABEE: The guiding
4 document will be the baseline management plan
5 submitted by the incoming contractor 60 days
6 after the contract award.

7 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Has that
8 ever gone through the EIS process? No, it's
9 not?

10 MR. AL FARABEE: No. The EIS
11 process happens first. That document will not
12 be implemented with respect to EIS evolutions
13 until the EIS is approved.

14 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Well, it
15 would seem that the process or procedure that
16 you're proposing for entombment should go
17 through an EIS, and have been circulated with
18 your notice tonight, in terms of the basic
19 right for the public to comment on.

20 MR. AL FARABEE: One more
21 response to that. I disagree, in that the EIS
22 process will be evaluating the alternatives for
23 entombment, and the completed EIS will be the
24 authorizing envelope for the contractor to
25 implement.

1 Paul, do you have any clarifying
2 comments to that?

3 MR. PAUL DUNIGAN: I'm Paul
4 Dunigan, NEPA compliance officer for the

5 Hanford Site.

6 This public scoping under the Notice
7 of Intent is the first step in the EIS process.
8 The intent is to give the public an opportunity
9 to provide input to the alternatives and the
10 subject matter of the EIS. It will be used in
11 preparing the Draft Environmental Impact
12 Statement. It will be made available next year
13 for public comment.

14 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: So, for
15 the public process to be alive, then, the
16 contract, there would be no contract issued
17 until the ROD of 2005 for carrying out
18 entombment?

19 MR. AL FARABEE: There will be
20 no final action taken, no physical work will
21 begin. And the EIS would reflect the
22 discussions of the contract.

23 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Okay.

24 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Claude, let
25 me make a clarification. The impending FFTF

1 closer project is comprised basically of
2 completing the ongoing deactivation work and
3 the future decommissioning work.

4 We have the NEPA coverage for the
5 deactivation work, as I alluded to in the
6 presentation.

7 The final decommissioning work
8 cannot be done until the EIS process is done,
9 completed, as we have talked about here, and
10 what Paul mentioned, and a Record of Decision
11 is issued.

12 In the event of an award of the new
13 closure project contract, the contractor cannot
14 execute the decommissioning work until the EIS
15 and the Record of Decision is completed and
16 issued.

17 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Okay.

18 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: And there
19 will be an appropriate contract modification to
20 that, if necessary.

21 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Well, we
22 can visit that issue. That may be a point of
23 another discussion.

24 Congressman Hastings' Chief of Staff
25 had a question with regards to the capacity of

1 the plant, and I faxed that to you. And I ask
2 that we get some determination with regards to
3 the status of the plant. I guess the plant at
4 this point, recoverable, or has it been damaged
5 beyond recoverability?

6 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: AI? I am
7 going to defer that, AI, to you.

8 MR. PETER BENGTON: While AI
9 is coming to the mike, I would just suggest for
10 the acronym-deprived people here, EIS's are
11 Environmental Impact Statements, and the NEPA
12 process he is referring to, the federal
13 regulatory process for these decisions, in case
14 there are any questions around that.

15 If there are any acronyms or
16 questions, please raise your hand. We will try
17 to break from habits that are hard to break
18 sometimes.

19 MR. AL FARABEE: The question
20 that you are asking is outside of the scope of
21 this meeting, but I will out of courtesy answer
22 it, and that is one of recoverability.

23 It has been the position of the

24 Department that the reactor is restartable
25 until we drain the primary sodium from the

20

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 systems and drill a hole in the lower plenum of
2 the reactor. That's the answer to the
3 restartability question.

4 However, restartability is not an
5 issue for these proceedings because that
6 decision has been made. We are going to shut
7 down FFTF. That was the resolution in the ROD
8 of the PEIS, and the purpose of this meeting is
9 to solicit comments from the public on the
10 alternatives for the plant closure.

11 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: I respect
12 that answer. The Congressman's office wanted
13 to know that status. I think you got us half
14 way there. Primary sodium was drained. You
15 haven't drilled the hole. So what have you
16 done with the system, that's the question.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
19 you. Again, for definition, those that are

20 following along, ROD is Record of Decision.

21 Was there another acronym? I think

22 there may have been.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NEPA.

24 MR. PETER BENGTON: NEPA,

25 National Environmental Policy Act.

21

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 Was there another question, sir? Do

2 you have one? Was there another -- any

3 comments, clarifying items? If not, then --

4 Come to the mike, please, and then

5 he is the last gentleman, we will move ahead

6 for the formal public comment.

7 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Harold

8 Anderson, Richland. I was just wondering what

9 the other two sources of sodium to be disposed?

10 One was the Hallam Reactor, and I think the

11 other one was called --

12 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Sodium

13 reactor experiment.

14 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Thank

15 you.

16 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Those are
17 inventories of the radioactively contaminated
18 sodium. One of them, as I said, was about
19 7,000 gallons of the sodium. It came from the
20 sodium reactor experiment. The sodium reactor
21 experiment is a reactor at Canoga Park, back in
22 the 1970s. It's been stored at Hanford since
23 then.

24 The Hallam Reactor, radioactively
25 contaminated sodium inventory, came from the

22

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 Hallam Reactor in Nebraska. It's since been in
2 storage in three tanks in the 2727-W facility
3 at 200 West.

4 And then of course the 260,000
5 gallons of the bulk FFTF sodium, which is
6 essentially the sodium coolant.

7 MR. PETER BENGTON: Any other
8 comments, questions, clarifying questions?

9 If not, at this point I would like
10 to, without any objection, we are ready for

11 formal comment.

12 At this point we will begin the
13 formal public comment process for this scoping
14 meeting. Please come at the mike, and if you
15 would list your name and affiliation, we would
16 appreciate that.

17 Are there, I guess before I proceed
18 with some other ramifications, any formal
19 comments from elected officials or community
20 leaders that would like to make formal comments
21 up front as part of this process?

22 Thank you. I see one request.

23 Okay.

24 With that, I would like to formally
25 open the public comment period for this comment

23

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 time for this scoping of the Environmental
2 Impact Statement for FFTF at 7:30 p.m. on
3 September 22nd, 2004. The public comment
4 period began on August 13th of this year, and
5 runs until October 8th.

6 Sir, if you would go ahead, give us
7 the comment. I have several cards here.
8 And if you have not signed up for
9 public comment yet, please do so, or let me
10 know, and I will go according to the cards that
11 I have received of people who would like to
12 make their comment after this gentleman does.

13 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Thank you.
14 I am Claude Oliver, Benton County Commissioner.

15 I headed up a community task force
16 for the past four years to look at alternative
17 considerations for the Fast Flux Test Facility,
18 primarily to assist the commercialization of
19 the plant for the inception of medical isotope
20 production to meet our nation's medical needs.

21 Tonight I am going to provide a
22 series of documents indexed that has been
23 presented to DOE officials at this time. We do
24 have additional copies, Mr. Farabee, or Mr.
25 Chapin, if others should desire, so, roughly

2 And I do want to give appreciation
3 to the Department of Energy for the Holland
4 record. The Holland report became known to us
5 in this community as a document that Mike
6 Collins, the manager of Brookhaven Labs,
7 developed. And he developed that document for
8 a very good process of bringing in qualified
9 experts to assist him from throughout the
10 nation.

11 This initiated action was at the
12 request of Congressman Doc Hastings, recognized
13 by Secretary Spencer Abraham, as a review
14 process of the decisions that had been
15 determined and arrived at prior to his watch.

16 The most important thing that
17 occurred with regards to the development of the
18 Holland report, it accepted and recommended a
19 dual mission for the reactor.

20 It recommended that the federal
21 government would have mission concerns such as
22 Argonne waste transmutation research needs that
23 the nation had to get performed, that the
24 capability existed within this reactor to do
25 that.

1 It also recognized that a commercial
2 medical isotope program would be viable in
3 terms of a combined approach, and that both the
4 health needs of the nation could be addressed
5 and the national energy testing platform that
6 the Department of Energy had, has, could be
7 utilized.

8 And with that report coming down, it
9 was very positive. Many people thought that
10 that report would be sufficient for the
11 Department to make a go-ahead determination and
12 restart the FFTF with that approach.

13 The greatest deficiency in this
14 process, where the FFTF began to be compared to
15 a reactor in Idaho, and began to be compared to
16 a reactor in Tennessee, those Senators,
17 Congressional delegation, stood up and fought
18 in the state of Tennessee for the continued use
19 of that reactor. Those Congressional
20 delegations and those Senators stood up in the
21 state of Idaho and spoke on behalf of the
22 continued use, operation of that reactor.

23 Both of those reactors are grossly
24 inferior to the Fast Flux Test Facility. Less

25 capability. Basic testing platform for the

26

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 next generation reactors does not exist in

2 those two reactors.

3 The Department of Energy knew that.

4 The Department of Energy went the extra mile to

5 bring that to the people of Washington state

6 through this document.

7 And I have to deliver the sad

8 commentary that neither of our U.S. Senators

9 weighed in in that context. We have been

10 abandoned by our two U.S. Senators.

11 Now, this public hearing process is

12 open, and the group of officials that worked on

13 this project long and hard wrote to our

14 Attorney General, Christine Gregoire. She is

15 the chief environmental compliance officer for

16 the people of Washington state, to our two

17 United States Senators, and Congressman

18 Hastings, asking those people to weigh in right

19 now.

20 So, we will keep the door open, I

21 think you said until October the 8th, for those
22 comments come in. But a group of us have
23 requested that they do weigh in. And we
24 appreciate the Department for giving that
25 opportunity.

27

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 Now, going on into the Locke to
2 Abraham, we had a very good letter from
3 Governor Gary Locke which we are going to
4 include in the letter tonight, in support of a
5 commercialization of the FFTF. And there will
6 be other documents forthcoming to indicate that
7 Washington State House of Representatives went
8 on record in support of this, 85 to 8, in
9 support of commercialization of the FFTF.

10 We then have an additional item that
11 Secretary Tommy Thompson on October the 8th,
12 2002, offered his support for commercialization
13 for medical isotopes. There is a major need
14 that it has for this nation that is not being
15 addressed.

16 Our two U.S. Senators haven't heard
17 his words yet. People are dying because they
18 can't get medical isotopes. And so Secretary
19 Tommy Thompson wrote to Spencer Abraham. People
20 in this administration didn't believe that
21 could be done.

22 It was done. And again, we have not
23 had people in elected position do their jobs,
24 with people sticking their necks out on our
25 behalf in Washington, D.C. That is included in

28

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 the record.

2 We have a fact sheet for Mirari
3 medical isotope commercial venture that has had
4 extensive discussions with the Department of
5 Energy.

6 We cannot speak on their behalf. We
7 can only conclude that those discussions were
8 very positive and opened up several opportunity
9 doors that need to be further explored in the
10 venture of medical isotopes for this nation,
11 utilizing the FFTF.

12 There are other indications,
13 attached with that letter.

14 We have the Radiological Society of
15 North America advocating the national
16 production center needs to be built. That is
17 provided to the Department of Energy.

18 We have continued support expressed
19 by the RSNA people in 1999 of the FFTF when it
20 is available.

21 And then we also, following with
22 Governor Locke's endorsement, recognition that
23 the people of Washington State could utilize
24 the FFTF to bring in significant research
25 dollars for their projects throughout the

1 entire state.

2 So, FFTF would bless this region in
3 quantum leaps, and with this loss, would not be
4 able to.

5 The report on accomplishments of the
6 Fast Flux Test Facility, I asked questions on

7 that earlier. I think there is a grave concern
8 that you have a document that is developed
9 outside of the EIS process, that should be
10 developed in the context of this hearing on
11 that document.

12 It was not presented to the public.

13 You have not given us the opportunity to
14 comment on that document.

15 I'm going to also go to the motion
16 of summary judgment, Judge Shea's ruling.
17 Judge Shea offered a very good ruling, saying
18 that you did have to do the EIS. We thank him
19 for that. That is why we are here tonight.

20 A lot of people said Benton County
21 lost. We won.

22 The question is, what are we going
23 to do with this EIS process?

24 We have additional documents that
25 are very, very relevant to this review at this

1 time. And what we have is that the basic
2 documentation needs supplemental EIS issues to

3 be addressed. You have the order, the relevant
4 requirements out of 10 CFR 1021.314 that
5 require a Supplemental Environmental Impact
6 Statement be made. And we have included that
7 in the package.

8 What that goes into looking at the
9 documents that then follow that have never been
10 factored in this EIS process.

11 The document that I initially
12 referred to is "A Technology Roadmap for
13 Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems," dated
14 December 2002. And on that document on page 38
15 it expressly asks that there be a sodium cooled
16 fast reactor system available for this nation,
17 expressly in this document.

18 This has never been factored in the
19 EIS process, and that is why you need to comply
20 with the Supplemental EIS to factor that in
21 this document.

22 There was an additional report in
23 January 2003, the report to Congress on
24 "Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative: The Future
25 Path for Advanced Spent Fuel Treatment and

1 Transmutation Research. "

2 Again, this document, a Department
3 of Energy document, expressly calls for sodium
4 fast flux reactor.

5 Again, it has never been factored
6 into consideration for this departmental use
7 need, that the Department is telling the people
8 of this nation that it needs to be available.

9 There is also being submitted to the
10 record, an audit report, this is the GAO Audit
11 Report on Plutonium-38. The plutonium-238
12 production issue with regards to a viability
13 for this nation, we are dependent currently on
14 Russia for supplies. The alternative is to be
15 developed in Oak Ridge.

16 There has never been an EIS done in
17 Oak Ridge to confirm that capability exists in
18 Oak Ridge prior to destroying your capability
19 at the FFTF in Washington state. There needs
20 to be a Supplemental EIS to address that need.

21 It has to be done in an official
22 document.

23 Again, the generation for
24 implementation strategy is dated September,
25 2003, it clearly expresses on page 8 the need

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 for the Fast Spectrum Fuel Testing needed for
2 the US DOE national programs.
3 Probably one of the most telling
4 items we are going to give you tonight is a
5 scientist report back to a journalist in
6 Washington state, back East, while he was
7 walking the streets in Japan, and this
8 gentleman was the co-Chair of the Gen IV group,
9 and there were several other groups that
10 participated in this group. He says, he's
11 telling this journalist as he looks at Japan
12 and France to try to find the testing that you
13 will lose here if you destroy this reactor.
14 "We quickly determined that four of
15 the selected Generation IV concepts could
16 require -- would require fast spectrum
17 irradiation testing of fuels and materials.
18 FFTF has been our only possibility for
19 accomplishing such testing on a serious scale."
20 This has not been factored from an
21 expert's point of view. He goes in on, "In

22 fact, we are currently preparing for a
23 collaboratively irradiation test in the Phenix
24 reactor in France as part of the U.S.'s effort
25 in the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative. And we

33

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 are finding the experiments to be more time
2 consuming and cumbersome than originally
3 envisioned, and the benefit will be
4 considerably more limited than a similar test
5 would be had we been able to performed in
6 EBR-II or the FFTF."

7 And you have a national expert
8 telling a journalist that we desperately need
9 the Fast Flux Test Facility.

10 I know what the hearing is about
11 tonight. Restart is not a consideration.
12 Political muscle has driven this process
13 exactly where it's at today. And political
14 muscle can reverse this process exactly where
15 it is at today as well.

16 If this Department has a functioning

17 reactor, as Congressman Hastings' chief of
18 staff wanted to know, and I think Mr. Farabee
19 dodged the bullet completely on that, but he
20 stuck his neck out far enough to say it's half
21 way there.

22 And the other element, when we gave
23 up on the commercial side, to privatize this
24 thing, a commercial group would have to go to
25 Wall Street and borrow a billion dollars to

34

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 restart.

2 And when you borrow a billion
3 dollars from Wall Street, those folks want to
4 know they're putting their money down on
5 something you will be able to relicense, and
6 certify and punch and go.

7 When the Department drained the
8 primary sodium, what you did was force the
9 Department of Energy back into the review
10 process, so you are on the hot seat now,
11 whether or not this reactor would get used or
12 not. Not a commercial group that could have

13 saved the taxpayers a billion dollars, and
14 turned down a resource that this nation
15 desperately needs. That's what you made when
16 you drained the primary sodium.
17 You are back in the hot seat, ladies
18 and gentlemen, as the Department of Energy, and
19 you need to be, but as much in that hot seat,
20 you need to be our political representatives,
21 our two U.S. Senators, our Attorney General,
22 and our Congressmen need to weigh in, and we
23 will be watching for their comments to come
24 forward before now and October 8th very, very
25 closely. Thank you.

35

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank you
2 for your comments.
3 At this point I will open it up,
4 public comment, I will give about five minutes
5 for individuals, and if you would like more
6 time, we will recycle, you will have a chance
7 to add your comments at that point.

8 Are there any time constraints where
9 people have to speak sooner than later?

10 The next person I have, the first
11 person I have on my list is Ralph Johnson. If
12 you would come to the mike.

13 MR. RALPH JOHNSON: Thank you.
14 Do I come through okay? A little hoarse there?

15 Anyway, I'm following Claude here,
16 and I guess I need to introduce myself a little
17 bit.

18 I'm a long time Benton County
19 resident, long time DOE associated with either
20 contractors or DOE itself. And in recent years
21 I have resolved into what you might call a
22 private consultant. And in that regard, with a
23 great passion for the cancer patients and the
24 need for medical isotopes worldwide.

25 I have actually donated a year and a

1 half of pro bono consulting time working on it.

2 So I have a pretty good background.

3 And then as far as FFTF itself, when

4 I first came here, I actually participated in
5 the safety analysis work as well as the design
6 concept when it was first going.

7 But with that kind of a background,
8 and having been that close to the situation by
9 professional discipline, if you will, its
10 program management, and in that regard I have a
11 lot of experience in major, large projects, and
12 have actually worked with several DOE sites in
13 what you call major system acquisition.

14 Major system acquisition begins with
15 the design, into the construction, in the
16 operation, and ultimately it ends up with the
17 decommissioning. And so that's kind of the
18 baby in the water that we're now attempting to
19 throw out the window, if you will.

20 But with that kind of a background,
21 I have two concerns, and suggestions of what
22 could be done. And so I speak for myself as a
23 private consultant, and hopefully for the
24 people of Benton County.

25 But the number 1 item, concern, is

1 what's called a TPA, Tri-Party Agreement, which
2 basically is DOE, Washington State, and the
3 EPA.

4 It's my understanding that the
5 responsibility for NEPA, National Environmental
6 Policy Act, has been delegated by EPA to the
7 state of Washington. So in a sense the state
8 of Washington is in the saddle.

9 And, so, I feel that this TPA has
10 violated the citizens of Benton County in
11 assuring proper management of the FFTF, from
12 its fruitful operation, its planning for
13 possible uses, and its disposal. And I have
14 three subsets as to that reason.

15 Number 1 is inappropriate
16 satisfaction of the intent and provisions of
17 NEPA. And the NEPA's decision-making process
18 that allows the identification of alternative
19 options directed toward optimum savings of the
20 U.S. government and future benefits of Benton
21 County citizens. That is point one.

22 Point two, lack of involvement by
23 their apparent own decree of the Hanford
24 Advisory Group. Hanford Advisory Group has
25 really been off limits to FFTF and its

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 programmatic implications.

2 And then there's been no follow-up
3 of the Benton County lawsuit for clean
4 compliance to Judge Shea's ruling. Somebody
5 needs to look at that and come up with, has it
6 been done? If it has been done, has it been
7 done appropriately?

8 The fourth one, the blatant
9 appearance of political influence in the key
10 decisions towards future use and the disposal
11 methods.

12 And basically I ask, what happened
13 to adhering to government surplussing
14 procedures?

15 I've been involved in other DOE
16 sites that have been going through
17 decommissioning and surplussing, and I don't
18 even see the words in the programming, and that
19 bothers me.

20 Anyway, that's item one concern.

21 Item two concern, I would like to
22 call for an investigation by the Inspector

23 General of DOE and the Inspector General of the
24 Justice Department, who is intimately involved
25 in this lawsuit process.

39

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 And I have several points for
2 calling for that.
3 One, is inadequate, inappropriate
4 planning by DOE, state, and the TPA management
5 officials.
6 Second point. Not making the best
7 use of government capital resources and
8 materials also.
9 Third point. Compliance with all
10 the requirements of the procedures dealing with
11 major system acquisition, which I have this
12 background in. And have all basically in major
13 system acquisition, there are several
14 milestones from birth to death, and the last
15 one is decommissioning. So have those
16 decisions been appropriately addressed and put
17 away?

18 The next point, accelerated and
19 rushed procedures and procurements related to
20 the rapid dismantlement of the facilities'
21 essential functions.

22 Next, accelerated and rushed
23 implementation of deactivation activities,
24 including verification of all safety and
25 quality control procedures and results.

40

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 And DOE, that's their policy, that
2 it will be done safely, it will be done with
3 appropriate quality control.

4 We need verification that this in
5 deed was done in this hurried, rushed
6 deactivation.

7 The last one, a review of Washington
8 State's performance in meeting its obligations
9 of implementing its responsibilities relegated
10 to it by EPA.

11 And I have actually given thought to
12 addressing a letter to the national director of
13 the EPA and asking him, have you monitored

14 Washington State's performance of NEPA since
15 they are your delegated representative? And I
16 have never heard of any, and would like to see
17 that.

18 And I'd like to reserve the right to
19 submit additional material. What I am giving
20 today, I have just called initial input. And
21 I've got until the 8th to expand on that. And
22 maybe I will get some comments that may help
23 me. Thank you very much.

24 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
25 you, sir.

41

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 The next person that we have that is
2 signed up, and, again, if you are interested in
3 making comment, let me know, or there is a
4 sign-up card in the back of the room that we
5 can get to you. There are fax sheets, as well
6 as written comment forms that you can fill out
7 and submit tonight, or in the future during
8 this public comment period.

9 Tom Burk, are you here?

10 MR. TOM BURK: Thank you. My

11 name is Tom Burk. I live in Prosser,

12 Washington. I do work at the FFTF, but I am

13 here tonight representing myself.

14 I have comments on two of the

15 decommissioning alternatives proposed for

16 consideration in the EIS.

17 The first is the no action

18 alternative. I understand the DOE must include

19 the no action alternative for use as a basis

20 for comparing the impacts with the other action

21 alternatives.

22 However, I certainly hope that DOE

23 does not consider this to be a reasonable or

24 viable decommissioning option.

25 Under this alternative more than

1 3600 gallons of radioactive element sodium will

2 be left in the plant systems. This is clearly

3 unacceptable from a final decommissioning

4 standpoint. That's because sodium can and will

5 react with water if it intrudes into the
6 system, potentially damaging the systems,
7 leading to releases from the facility and
8 injuries to people.

9 Even in the case where there is no
10 liquid water intrusions, sodium will react with
11 moisture in the air, generating hydrogen and
12 caustic material that again could damage the
13 systems and lead to releases from the facility.

14 Although the current environmental
15 assessment does describe the establishment of
16 an inert gas blanket over the sodium residuals,
17 this clearly does not represent an acceptable
18 final condition for decommissioning.

19 Furthermore, experience at several
20 facilities around the world has shown that
21 delays in cleaning the sodium residuals can
22 result in significant problems at a later time.
23 Those problems are a result of both loss of
24 people who are knowledgeable of the systems and
25 sodium hazards, as well as degradation of the

1 systems themselves.

2 My second comment is on the removal
3 alternative. I agree that the removal
4 alternative should be considered as one of the
5 options. However, since the alternative
6 described in the NOI is not complete removal, I
7 don't understand why removal of the major
8 components of the primary systems would be
9 considered.

10 I do understand why removal of the
11 reactor vessel would be considered. It
12 contains a significant inventory of long-lived
13 radioisotopes due to activation of the steel.

14 However, the other primary system
15 components, such as pumps, heat exchangers,
16 piping and valves, are not activated and will
17 contain little or no contamination following
18 cleaning of the sodium residuals.

19 Removal of these components from the
20 containment building will significantly
21 increase both the cost and the risk of worker
22 injury during the decommissioning activity,
23 without any significant benefit.

24 I urge DOE to redefine the removal
25 alternative accordingly, or include an

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 additional alternative that would remove the
2 reactor vessel but leave these other components
3 in place.

4 Finally, although I know that
5 restart is not an alternative that's to be
6 considered in this EIS, I would like to thank
7 and applaud those people who worked so hard to
8 save the FFTF. Thank you.

9 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
10 you.

11 Next person that we have scheduled,
12 who signed up at this point, is Robert Beach.
13 Mr. Beach, are you available?

14 MR. ROBERT BEACH: I'm Robert
15 Beach, and I reside at 7803 West Deschutes
16 Avenue in South Kennewick, in Kennewick.

17 I request that the Department of
18 Energy sincerely consider the following
19 comments in scoping the EIS and the proposed
20 decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility.

21 Although I continue to believe that
22 DOE could and should have served the better
23 needs of the general public by restarting the

24 FFTF as an activity integrating several
25 programmatic needs, this has proven to be

45

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 impossible with the present organization of the
2 DOE.

3 The FFTF could have provided several
4 problematic needs in parallel operations, but
5 this is counter to the individual project
6 funding and management within the DOE.

7 Examples. Maintenance of DOE
8 technology related to fast reactors. We have
9 no fast reactors to maintain anybody's
10 technology on.

11 X weapons plutonium burn activities.
12 We are now shipping plutonium to France so it
13 could be made into mixed oxide fuel bundles.

14 Pu-238 production. We now buy it
15 from Russia. Support their technology and let
16 ours die.

17 Tritium production. We are now
18 using commercial reactors to produce weapons

19 materials.
20 Medical isotope production. We are
21 ignoring that.
22 Research into transportation of
23 waste. The resolution of the Yucca Mountain
24 fiasco.
25 Advanced fuel cycle research. We

46

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 need to recognize the fact that nuclear power
2 will be here. We need to accept that fact.
3 The DOE needs to develop it.
4 Some of these needs are now going by
5 the wayside. Others are being purchased from
6 outside of the USA, funding work in other
7 countries, and removing jobs and knowledge and
8 experience from the U.S.A. economy.
9 Neither of these outcomes is
10 reasonable for the betterment of the country.
11 However, since the FFTF is to be
12 decommissioned, please consider the following:
13 First, the DOE should complete this
14 mission in compliance with, as a minimum, the

15 same directives to which a commercial reactor
16 would currently be decommissioned in the state
17 of Washington.

18 The DOE should be held to higher
19 standards than the commercial world. This EIS
20 should assure that the alternative chosen meets
21 or exceeds those requirements. The cleanup of
22 the FFTF site should not result in leaving
23 behind a new waste site for the State and the
24 general public to maintain. The entombment
25 alternative appears to only create another

1 waste site on the periphery of the Hanford Site
2 to the ultimate detriment of the general
3 public.

4 This may be safe from an
5 environmental impact, but so would placing the
6 waste site in the middle of Richland.

7 The area impacted by the DOE should
8 be contracted, not expanded by the
9 decommissioning activities.

10 The central plateau is presently the
11 designated waste site for Hanford.
12 Third. The evolution of the
13 alternatives should include the long-term cost
14 impacts. Risk management within the DOE should
15 identify where funding should be used. If the
16 risk to wait for FFTF decommissioning are
17 minimal and the other projects are of a far
18 more serious nature, then the no action
19 alternative should be taken, so the full
20 cleanup can be accomplished at a later date.
21 We have to balance the budget, even
22 though the politicians don't think so.
23 The cleanup should not be
24 constrained to an entombment state, simply
25 because the immediate costs are lower. The

1 long-term surveillance cost and probable
2 eventual removal cost should be considered.
3 Several of the included processes; for example,
4 bulk sodium disposition, fuel disposition,
5 sodium bonded fuel disposition, depleted

6 uranium disposition, lead disposition, and
7 others, have alternative processes that should
8 be reviewed and evaluated.

9 Some of these are either evaluated
10 or partially evaluated in other NEPA documents.

11 The environmental effects of each process
12 considered should be defined and evaluated.

13 For example, the bulk sodium is
14 currently postulated to be processed as sodium
15 hydroxide at ANL-West for return to ORP for
16 use.

17 Alternatively, for cost reasons, the
18 new contractor for the FFTF closure might have
19 already proposed to process the sodium in
20 temporary equipment on the Hanford Site.

21 If this process is to be used, the
22 local environmental impacts and the accidents
23 should be evaluated in this EIS, or the process
24 not allowed.

25 If the alternative for processing to

1 waste, instead of for use within ORP is
2 possible, then the environmental impact of that
3 decision should also be evaluated within this
4 EIS for the information of the general public
5 as to why the decisions are made.

6 This program should not be like the
7 car dealer that uses the bait and switch
8 technique.

9 Thank you for this opportunity to
10 provide my input to your decisions. I believe
11 that the decommissioning should be run as a
12 demonstration of how good the DOE could
13 perform, not as a usual low cost alternative of
14 minimal scope to barely meet requirements.

15 After all, when you make the
16 decision to throw one billion dollars away, is
17 the additional cost to do the job right of
18 consequence? Thank you.

19 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
20 you, sir.

21 Our next person who has signed up
22 for comment Carl Holder.

23 MR. CARL HOLDER: Thank you.

24 My name is Carl Holder. I live in Pasco,
25 Washington. And I have been involved with the

1 FFTF, save the FFTF program for quite some
2 time.

3 Just a little bit of the timeline I
4 think is important on the EIS process, what
5 we've gone through to get to this evening.
6 On September the 18th of 2002 DOE
7 news announced that there would be a
8 decommissioning and dismantlement activities at
9 the FFTF to begin tomorrow. That was two years
10 ago today.

11 Seeing this environmental disaster
12 about to unfold, Benton County sued the
13 Department of Energy to force compliance with
14 NEPA regulations, and here we are today to
15 witness the Environmental Impact Statement
16 process.

17 But let us look at the law under CFR
18 1502.5. It talks about the timing and when
19 should this EIS process take place. And it
20 says that "The agency shall commence
21 preparation of an Environmental Impact
22 Statement as close as possible to the time the
23 agency is developing or presented with
24 proposals so that preparation can be completed

25 in time for final statement to be included in

51

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 any recommendation or report on the proposal."

2 Well, this is two years after they
3 made the announcement. So I think the timing's
4 a little bit late.

5 Also under 40 CFR 502.14, there are
6 supposed to be alternatives to the proposed
7 action that are supposed to be available for
8 comment. And it says in the law that this
9 section is the heart of the Environmental
10 Impact Statement. It should present the
11 environmental impacts of the proposal and the
12 alternatives in comparative form, sharply
13 defining the issues and providing a clear basis
14 for choice among options by the decision maker
15 and the public.

16 Well, two years after they announce
17 that they are going to decommission the FFTF, I
18 think that the timing is a little bit late for
19 all of the alternatives, particularly with the

20 events that the facility having already drained
21 many of the sodium systems and deactivation
22 activities continuing.

23 But then again let us look into the
24 mind of the Department of Energy while they
25 were developing the environmental -- the

52

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 program at the Fast Flux Test Facility, and
2 from Fluor's master contract on September 26th
3 of '02, the end state is defined, complete
4 containment by entombment, and the FFTF project
5 would be entombed, and this would be a CERCLA
6 action.

7 So, my problem with this entire
8 process is not that it is not happening, and I
9 applaud that. I applaud Benton County for
10 having the foresight to make sure that the
11 National Environmental Policy Act rules and
12 regulations are followed in the decommissioning
13 of the nuclear reactor.

14 But I just find that two years after
15 the announcement of decommissioning is not in

16 the spirit of the law in timing. Thank you.

17 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
18 you.

19 The next commenter that we have
20 signed up, and, again, if you would like to
21 make public comment, please let me know, or
22 sign up in the back and we will make time for
23 you as well.

24 At this point Fred Raab is next on
25 the list.

53

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 MR. FRED RAAB: Yes. My name
2 is Fred Raab. I reside at 232 Wallace Street
3 in Richland.

4 But I am here tonight representing
5 LIGO as a stakeholder in the decisions made in
6 the Environmental Impact Statement.

7 Just to provide a little bit of
8 history, in the early '90s, the DOE put in a
9 proposal to try to get the National Science
10 Foundation to locate this proposed

11 gravitational wave detector on the Hanford Site
12 as a part of an economic diversification
13 strategy.

14 There was a search of 19 sites, in
15 18 states, and eventually the Hanford Site won
16 out as one of the States, as one of the sites
17 where LIGO would be built.

18 A large consideration in that was
19 the fact that the amount of vibration at the
20 Hanford Site was extremely low and extremely
21 well characterized, and as the DOE asserted, it
22 was expected to stay that way for the
23 foreseeable future.

24 We are very sensitive to the amount
25 of vibration on the site. It didn't show up on

1 the map because the map showed decommissioning
2 facilities.

3 We are commissioning. But our
4 site's laboratory buildings are within 2.7
5 miles of the FFTF, and we have relied very much
6 to be able to operate the facility that the

7 level of ground vibrations not be seriously
8 affected.

9 It's a real concern that will have
10 to be treated in any of the options considered
11 in the EIS.

12 Just to put a point on it, right now
13 we are being severely molested by the IDF
14 operation out on the Hanford Site, which
15 basically severely restricts the range that
16 LIGO can operate while the earth moving
17 activities are occurring at IDF, which is at a
18 further distance from the site than is the
19 FFTF.

20 So, really my comment is that some
21 plan for mitigation of the effects of the
22 vibration and for the impacts on our
23 international scientific partners in running
24 observing missions of LIGO and the world's
25 gravitational wave will have to be taken into

1 account in the environmental scoping, the

2 Environmental Impact Statement.

3 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
4 you, sir.

5 I have two more cards here. Ken
6 Dobbin.

7 MR. KEN DOBBIN: Yes. Good
8 evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am Ken
9 Dobbin, Councilman, City of West Richland.

10 I will be submitting my comments in
11 written form, so I will just briefly tonight, I
12 want to make sure that I'm not blind siding the
13 Department of Energy or our U. S. Senators,
14 Congressmen, or Attorney General.

15 But the United States Government is
16 making an incredibly stupid move in shutting
17 down the FFTF, and ignoring five United States
18 Department of Energy reports that have been
19 written since July 2001, the last one is
20 September 2003.

21 All of these reports say that the
22 fast reactor is needed for energy production,
23 for waste reduction, and for general health and
24 welfare of the people of the United States.

25 What I will be writing in my

1 statement to the Department is that the
2 Environmental Impact Statement must include
3 this information which came at a later date
4 than any of the Environmental Assessments that
5 have been stated earlier in this meeting.

6 I listened carefully, and all of
7 those were done prior to these reports. So, I
8 believe that the federal law requires that the
9 Department of Energy include this information
10 in the Environmental Impact Statement, because
11 of such a tremendous impact on the environment
12 due to the shutdown process.

13 And I will be asking the United
14 States Senators, Congressman Hastings, and our
15 attorney General Christine Gregoire, to weigh
16 in on this vital part of the environmental
17 impact process.

18 And again I will submit my comments
19 in formal writing at a later date, prior to
20 October 8th.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
23 you, sir.

24 The last card, Mr. Oliver, you have
25 a card. Do you wish to make an additional

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 statement.

2 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Only to
3 offer, there are additional written comments
4 that will be forthcoming before the October 8th
5 cutoff. Thank you.

6 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
7 you.

8 This public scoping meeting is
9 scheduled to run until 10 p.m. And barring any
10 additional comments at this time, publicly,
11 verbally, you can make that now, let me know,
12 otherwise we will temporarily suspend formal
13 comment period at this point. And if somebody
14 comes to me between now and ten o'clock, we
15 will put them on the clock, if you will, and
16 take it verbally.

17 Otherwise, again, there are fact
18 sheets and materials and addresses in the back,
19 if you would like to submit public comment
20 between now and October 8th, and we do very

21 much appreciate the fact that you came out this
22 evening.

23 Thank you for a great turnout, for
24 your participation. And with that, at this
25 point in time, almost 8:15 p.m., we will

58

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 conclude at this point the formal public
2 comment for this scoping meeting of the FFTF.

3 (Short recess).

4 MR. PETER BENGTON: Ladies
5 and gentlemen, if I could have your attention,
6 I apparently misplaced one of the cards. We
7 have one more individual who has requested to
8 make a public comment. And if you wouldn't
9 mind taking your seats, or your conversation
10 outside, we would like to proceed with that.

11 At this point I have one more person
12 that would like to make public comment.

13 Ms. Alexander, would you come
14 forward, then.

15 MS. LYNN ALEXANDER: My name
16 is Lynn Alexander, and I reside in Richland,

17 Washington.
18 I have worked on the FFTF all the
19 way from helping them create and prepare the
20 cells before inerting. I was in probably every
21 one of the cells before they were inerted. I
22 was one of the few people to stand on the
23 turntable at the bottom IN cell and look all
24 the way to the top of containment before they
25 inerted that cell.

59

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 I also participated in receiving the
2 shipments of powder, developing them into
3 pallets, fuel pins, fuel bundles, doing neutron
4 radiography of them, helping work with the tag
5 gas capsules, and all the intricate parts of
6 putting this reactor together. Nonetheless to
7 say, it's not a reactor that can be compared to
8 any other in the entire world.

9 And I was there for start-up, and
10 then I went back to 300 Area to help on other
11 projects, and I'm there now again.

12 And I'm concerned why DOE only
13 considers entombment when there are other
14 options.

15 One is a museum option, like B
16 Reactor. Entombment ultimately insults the
17 technology of scientists and the builders.

18 The other option was a billion
19 dollar privatization offer, legitimized and
20 validated by Standard & Poors, a reputable
21 agency.

22 And there was a rumored interest by
23 Japan to purchase the FFTF for five billion for
24 commercialization.

25 And I know that DOE's always been

1 very specific about documentation being very
2 timely, that we don't proceed beyond a step
3 unless it's been satisfied, and I do believe if
4 they were to examine this closely, that there
5 have been some real problems from the area of
6 documentation, particularly in not considering
7 all the options and making a strict ruling on

8 what the outcome would be before having
9 everything considered.

10 Small comment, but I reserve the
11 right to amend, modify or add additional
12 material to these comments.

13 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank you
14 very much. And that is true. You can add and
15 modify your comments between now and October
16 8th, and then again, the NEPA process will
17 begin as we described earlier when the draft is
18 issued later in early 2005. So, again, thank
19 you.

20 Additional public comment?

21 MR. JIM CURTIS: May I speak a
22 second?

23 MR. PETER BENGTON: Of course,
24 you may. You can have another attorney.

25 MR. JIM CURTIS: I am Jim

1 Curtis, and live in West Richland. Now I am
2 retired from Hanford, about 35 years out there.

3 And I was on the design of the FFTF, the
4 construction of the FFTF, and also was quality
5 assurance manager -- or quality assurance
6 engineer during that time. And also I was part
7 of the start-up.

8 But one of the things I ended up
9 with was as a Project Manager, there are a lot
10 of projects all over Hanford. And every time
11 before I would start a project, and propose a
12 project, to DOE, I had to comply with the NEPA
13 requirements. And I had to have a document in
14 hand approved before I could get started.

15 Now, I read this NEPA document here,
16 and this was just -- and this was dated August
17 13th, 2004, and this is the first time anybody,
18 you know, has come out and said, well, hey,
19 we've got something in NEPA, we applied the
20 NEPA requirements.

21 But the policy act of 1969, NEPA,
22 says, hey, before you start a project, you're
23 going to have to have this approval and go
24 through the process of the EIS and things like
25 this.

1 Now, I understand, and I am looking
2 at this, it says, you did an EA, shut down EA
3 and a FONSI.

4 Well, what is a FONSI?

5 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Finding of No
6 Significant Impact.

7 MR. JIM CURTIS: Okay. I
8 would like to see a copy of these. I would
9 like to see a copy of the EA that was proposed
10 before you started all of this hoopla about
11 shutting down the FFTF.

12 And you called it deactivation.
13 Well, when you pull something apart, you can't
14 use it any longer, that's decommissioning. I
15 don't care what you say. It is, you say it's
16 deactivation. You were doing decommissioning
17 all the time. As soon as you moved the sodium
18 or anything else, you were decommissioning it.
19 And you said it was deactivation.

20 Well, we are still going to do
21 deactivation. We are going to do deactivation
22 while we are writing the EIS. Is that true?

23 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Yes.

24 MR. JIM CURTIS: Well, that
25 doesn't meet the requirements of the NEPA

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 requirements of 1969.

2 Now, I really don't understand this
3 whole process. You know, I have been involved
4 in a lot of projects, all over Hanford, for
5 many years, and here you are not even abiding
6 by the laws of your own country. And you are
7 getting away with it.

8 You did this over in Idaho, I know
9 that, and all the rest of them, too, you did by
10 a FONSI.

11 Well, give me a copy of the FONSI,
12 written, way back when, before you started it,
13 and the EA, would you?

14 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Uh-huh.

15 MR. JIM CURTIS: You will
16 produce these documents, dated back then? Is
17 this true?

18 MR. DOUG CHAPIN: Yes. We
19 will provide that for you.

20 MR. JIM CURTIS: Okay.

21 Appreciate it. Thank you.

22 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank
23 you, sir.
24 There is a sign-up sheet, and the
25 materials, that you can sign, leave your name

64

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 and address, and make sure you distinguish
2 where you would like that material issued, that
3 can be sent to you as part of the public
4 record. You are welcome to it.

5 Any other formal comments for this
6 evening's meeting? Yes, Ma'am.

7 MS. ROBERTA PETERS: Roberta
8 Peters from Richland.

9 I am not a nuclear engineer. I
10 don't know anything technically that you are
11 talking about. My expertise is management.
12 It just boggles my mind that you are
13 going ahead and demolishing something when it's
14 very obvious that there are documents and
15 things that need to be looked at before those
16 final blows are made to destroy such a valuable
17 resource.

18 And as a taxpayer, it just boggles
19 my mind to think that the DOE is acting in this
20 way. And not only that, but for all of the
21 people that will not have the benefit of the
22 things that could come from this wonderful
23 facility that we do have.
24 I do hope you will stop that process
25 immediately until you get all the documents,

65

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 information, and then continue on. It is
2 something that should have been done before.
3 Thank you.
4 MR. PETER BENGTON: Thank you
5 for your comment.
6 Another call. Anybody else at this
7 point that would like to make comment?
8 Otherwise, again, you can make your formal
9 comments between now and October 8th and issue
10 them in either written form, fax form, or by
11 E-mail, and that information, those addresses
12 and phone numbers are in the back of the room.

13 We will be here until ten o'clock
14 this evening. If you would like to make a
15 comment between now and then, we will record it
16 for the official record.

17 Anybody else? Not seeing any
18 additional names, again, we will officially
19 close this comment period and reopen it if
20 interest is there, please let me know, thank
21 you.

22 (Hearing recessed).

23 MR. PETER BENGTON: At this
24 point and time I am going to officially close
25 this public meeting for the scoping of the Fast

66

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 Flux Test Facility Decommissioning EIS. It is
2 10:01 on September 22nd, 2004. Thank you all
3 for being here.

4

5 (10:01 p.m.)

6

7 * * *

8

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
2 County of Benton)
3

4 I, William J. Bridges, do hereby
5 certify that at the time and place heretofore
6 mentioned in the caption of the foregoing
7 matter, I was a Certified Shorthand Reporter
8 and Notary Public for Washington; that at said
9 time and place I reported in stenotype all
10 testimony adduced and proceedings had in the
11 foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were
12 reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing
13 transcript consisting of 67 typewritten pages
14 is a true and correct transcript of all such
15 testimony adduced and proceedings had and of
16 the whole thereof.

17 Witness my hand at Kennewick,
18 Washington, on this _____ day of October,
19 2004.

20

21

22 _____
23 William J. Bridges
24 CSR NO. 2421
25 Certified Shorthand Reporter
Notary Public for Washington
My commission expires: 11-1-07